

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/074,009	02/14/2002	Samuel H. Slishman	UNME-0118-1	9066
21186	7590 10/04/2005		EXAMINER	
SCHWEGM.	AN, LUNDBERG, W	MENDEZ, MANUEL A		
121 SOUTH EIGHT STREET			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402			3763	

DATE MAILED: 10/04/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

0)
ע

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Cumment	10/074,009	SLISHMAN, SAMUEL H.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Manuel Mendez	3763			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI	lely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>05 Ju</u>	ly 2005.				
,— ,	action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar	nce except for formal matters, pro	secution as to the merits is			
closed in accordance with the practice under E	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1,4,7,28 and 29 is/are pending in the a 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1,4,7,28 and 29 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the orange Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the orange and the correction is objected to by the Example 11).	epted or b) objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of 	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been receive (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No d in this National Stage			
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary (Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:				

Application/Control Number: 10/074,009

Art Unit: 3763

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 4, 7, 28 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over George et al., in view of French Publication 2083725, United Kingdom Patent No. 364528, and in further view of Naatz, Broselow, Munch, and Turner.

George et al., discloses a syringe having a barrel and having a scale with volumetric measuring indicia. George et al., does not disclose a syringe barrel having numeric non-volumetric measuring indicia. However, the use of numeric non-volumetric measuring indicia is conventional in the art as evidenced by the teachings of French Publication 2083725 and United Kingdom Patent No. 364,528.

French Publication 2083725 discloses a system characterized by the fact that the medication to be used, orally, or by injection, is bottled in concentrated form in a flask or container which is marked with calibrations or graduations which permit the dilution of the medication so as to obtain a dilution of the active ingredient which will correspond to the weight or body surface area of the individual. Additionally, figure 1, shows a container having numeric non-volumetric measuring indicia. In figure 9, United

Application/Control Number: 10/074,009

Art Unit: 3763

Kingdom Patent No. 364,528 shows a container having a scale that indicates the dosage for a child and for an adult.

Based on the teachings of French Publication 2083725 and United Kingdom Patent No. 364,528, for a person of ordinary skill in the art, modifying George et al., with numeric non-volumetric measuring indicia as taught by the cited patents would have been considered obvious because such modification would have increased the accuracy of infusing medication into the body and more importantly, the avoidance or errors during the infusion process.

Concerning the use of multiple numeric non-volumetric measuring indicia, the case law has established that the duplication of a well-known element of an apparatus should not provide patentable weight to the claim. <u>In re Harza</u>, 274 F.2d 669, 124 USPQ 378 (CCPA 1960). Therefore, the use of multiple numeric non-volumetric measuring indicia in a container such as a syringe should have been a modification considered obvious by a person of ordinary skill in the art.

The examiner has included the **Naatz**, **Broselow**, **Munch**, **and Turner** patents to further demonstrate the conventionality of using numeric non-volumetric measuring indicia in containers.

Conclusion

In view of the new grounds for rejection, this action is not a final office action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Manuel Mendez whose telephone number is 703-272-4977. The examiner can normally be reached on 0730-1800 hrs.

Art Unit: 3763

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Nicholas D. Lucchesi can be reached on 571-272-4977. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Manuel Mendez Primary Examiner Art Unit 3763

MM